

REMARKS

Amendments

Amendments to the Claims

Applicant has amended the claims to more particularly point out what Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, Applicant's claims now recite that a network access device is accessible by a consumer device and another device coupled to the network. No new matter has been added as a result of these amendments.

Rejections

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5 and 10-14

Claims 1-5 and 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious by Norris, U.S. Patent No. 5,557,748 (previously disclosed), Ricart, et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0165906 (previously disclosed), and Narayanaswami, U.S. Patent No. 6,980,175. Narayanaswami qualifies as prior art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) because it issued after Applicant's effective filing date. Applicant does not admit that Narayanaswami is prior art and reserves the right to swear behind the reference at a later date. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of these three references does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Applicant's claims 1-5 and 10-14, as amended.

Narayanaswami discloses configuring consumer devices with a smart pointing device. The devices configurable by the smart pointing are personal computers, personal digital assistants, and cell phones. The smart pointing device can configure a device coupled to the smart pointing device or another consumer device adjunct to the coupled device.

Independent claims 1 and 10, as amended, recite configuring a shared network access device according to user preferences, where the network access device is accessible by the consumer device and another device coupled to the network. The Examiner admits that Norris and Ricart do not teach or suggest configuring a shared

network access device according to user preferences and relies on Narayanaswami as disclosing this element. Narayanaswami appears to disclose configuring a consumer device such as a personal computer, personal digital assistant, or cell phone. But Narayanaswami does not teach or suggest configuring a shared network access device according to user preferences because this reference discloses only configuring a consumer device and not configuring a “shared network access device” that is different from a “consumer electronic device”, as claimed. Thus, none of Norris, Ricart, or Narayanaswami teach or suggest this claim element.

Furthermore, independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite that such a configurable “shared network access device” is accessible by the “consumer electronic device” and also by another device coupled to the network. This amendment further highlights the difference between the “consumer electronic device” and the configurable “shared network access device” as recited in the claims. Applicants maintain that Norris, Ricart, and Narayanaswami do not teach or suggest this further claim limitation. Therefore, Norris, Ricart, and Narayanaswami cannot render obvious claims 1 and 10 and claims 2-5 and 11-14 that depend from them. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 19, 20, 23-26 and 29-32

Claims 19, 20, 23-26 and 29-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious by Dharmadhikari, U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0065816 (previously cited), Ricart, and Narayanaswami. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Applicant’s claims 19, 20, 23-26 and 29-32.

Dharmadhikari discloses modifying a routing table based on a selected network interface of a local computer. A policy manager selects the network interface by matching the characteristics of the network interface with a set of user preferences.

Independent claims 19 and 25, as amended, recite configuring a shared network access device according to user preferences, where the network access device is accessible by the consumer device and another device coupled to the network. In

contrast, Dharmadhikari only receives the user preferences to configure a local computer and does not teach or suggest configuring a shared home network device as claimed. In addition, as per above, neither Ricart nor Narayanaswami teach or suggest configuring a shared home network device as claimed. Therefore, the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's independent claims 19 and 25 and claims 20, 23, 24, 26 and 29-32 that depend from them. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 6 and 15

Claims 6 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Norris, Dharmadhikari, Ricart, and Narayanaswami. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Applicant's claims 6 and 15. Claims 6 and 15 depend from independent claims 1 and 10, respectively. Independent claims 1 and 10, as amended, recite configuring a shared network access device according to user preferences, where the network access device is accessible by the consumer device and another device coupled to the network. However, because none of Norris, Dharmadhikari Ricart or Narayanaswami teach or suggest this element as claimed, the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's claims 1 and 10 and claims 6 and 15 that depend from them. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 7-9, and 16-18

Claims 7-9 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Norris, Ricart, Narayanaswami and Reed, U.S. Patent No. 6,754,504 (previously cited). Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Applicant's claims 7-9 and 16-18.

Reed discloses controlling a user's environmental condition within a predefined area based on the user's preference.

Claims 7-9 and 16-18 depend from independent claims 1 and 10. Independent claims 1 and 10, as amended, recite configuring a shared network access device according to user preferences, where the network access device is accessible by the

consumer device and another device coupled to the network. However, because Reed does not teach or suggest a shared network access device, Reed cannot be properly interpreted as disclosing the claimed element. As per above, none of Norris, Ricart, or Narayanaswami teach or suggest this element as claimed in claims 1 and 10. Therefore, the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's claims 1 and 10 and claims 7-9 and 16-18 that depend from them. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 21 and 27

Claims 21 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Dharmadhikari, Norris, Ricart, and Narayanaswami. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Applicant's claims 21 and 27. Claims 21 and 27 depend from independent claims 19 and 25. Independent claims 19 and 25, as amended, recite configuring a shared network access device according to user preferences, where the network access device is accessible by the consumer device and another device coupled to the network. However, as discussed above, none of Dharmadhikari, Norris, Ricart, or Narayanaswami teach or suggest this claimed element. Therefore, the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's claims 19 and 25 and claims 21 and 27 that depend from them. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

Claims 22 and 28

Claims 22 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Dharmadhikari, Ricart, and Bunney, US Patent No. 6,487,584 (previously disclosed). Applicant respectfully submits that the combination does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Applicant's claims 22 and 28.

Bunney discloses associating multiple terminal addresses with a user to allow the user access a common home page from multiple user terminals.

Claims 22 and 28 depend from independent claims 19 and 25. Independent claims 19 and 25, as amended, recite configuring a shared network access device according to

user preferences, where the network access device is accessible by the consumer device and another device coupled to the network. However, because Bunney only discloses associating multiple terminal addresses with a user, Bunney cannot teach or suggest configuring a shared network access device as claimed. As per above, none of Dharmadhikari, Ricart, or Narayanaswami teach or suggest this claimed element. Therefore, the combination cannot render obvious Applicant's claims 19 and 25 and claims 22 and 28 that depend from them. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination.

SUMMARY

Claims 1-32 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Eric Replogle at (408) 720-8300 x258.


Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR
& ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 5/1, 2006



Eric S. Replogle
Registration No. 52,161

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300